Proposal Reviews

#3: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

American Land Conservancy

Initial Selection Panel Review	
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review	
Land Acquisition	
Delta Regional Review	
External Scientific Review	#1 #2 #3 #4 #5
Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding	
Environmental Compliance	
Budget	

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 3

Applicant Organization: American Land Conservancy

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)
Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	**-**
In Part	**-**
With Conditions	**-**
Consider as Directed Action	**X**
Not Recommended	**-**

Amount: **$242,404**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This proposal is timely and builds upon previous CALFED Bay-Delta Program investments. The applicants note significant cost-sharing. The project is likely to provide substantial benefits if successful. However, there was insufficient information on monitoring, including collecting baseline data, for the Selection Panel to recommend funding. The Panel recommends the applicant return with a detailed monitoring plan and that CALFED consider this as a directed action.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 3

Applicant Organization: American Land Conservancy

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;
Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;
Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;
Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Superior	**The panel felt this was an above average proposal, but that it lacked a monitoring plan that should be included even though only construction costs are requested at this stage. One year of monitoring should be included prior to construction implementation. One concern was the sustainability of this plan using levees, etc. The applicants also need to spell out testable hypotheses and performance measures based on the monitoring plan.**
XAbove average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

   Goals. With an earlier CalFed grant they acquired the 537 acre Sun River property and developed a restoration plan for it and obtained permits. It will eventually be turned over to the USFWS for management when restoration and initial monitoring are complete. Currently there are 169 acres of marsh, riparian, and aquatic habitat and 368 acres of upland, mostly agriculture surrounded by levees. They propose to convert 180 acres of upland to marsh/aquatic habitat and enhance 174 acres of associated upland. To do this they will re-contour and build levees that will restore backwater floodplain habitat to improve flood management. They will also increase public use of the area and education, hunting, and boating opportunities.

Their goals and objectives are clear. Since the design and permitting has been done, it is timely and logical to fund this stage of the project now. There are no hypotheses per se. They state how their project addresses five CALFED goals.

Reviewers feel that the Budget Spread sheet indicates that the total CalFed funding will be spent in the first year where will the funding for the first 2 years of monitoring come from if it is all spent in the first year of the restoration phase? The reason for requesting funding should have been in the Executive Summary. It is timely and important.

There are no hypotheses being tested. The hypotheses section is a list of uncertainties and the proposed work will not directly support activities that might address these uncertainties. The plan fulfills several CALFED ERP goals.

Justification. The current levees fail periodically and a major portion of the property floods. The problem is that, although it offers flood relief, the water doesnt drain out and has to be pumped. Waves are generated by the wind and cause erosion of the levees that then need reconstructing. They would put in overflow weirs in existing levees set to overflow before floodwater levels reach elevations of the residential community. They would put in water drainage systems allowing drainage in a metered fashion to reduce downstream peaks. They would reconstruct some levees so they are sustainable over a long time. They will create some riparian islands to reduce wave energy and provide nesting habitat for Swainsons hawks etc. They will manage the upland pasture grazing to maximize use by cranes, geese, ibis, etc. They will create some earthen mounds for burrowing owls and the garter snake. Theyll put in a boat ramp and hunting and observations blinds.

The project will restore wetland and riparian habitats that will be used by target species (giant garter snake, sandhill cranes, etc.), provide flood control, and increase public access, so there is adequate justification to fund this now. One issue is that the conceptual model fails to show how the applicants envision recreation and education in a setting compatible with conditions that support at-risk species. The design portion of the project has been funded and is currently in place and ready to go the full-scale implementation is justified. The underlying basis for the proposed work is explained.

Reviewer: The design plan is reviewed by numerous agencies. Wildlands, Inc. has direct experience in implementing this type of work. It meets local, regional, state, and federal objectives for restoration.

Reviewer: In light of the dollars already spent on the project, the additional expenditures are well justified. The hard engineering approach is justified here.

The conceptual models are very general and poorly developed and without documentation. Removal of all riverfront levees would seem a simpler approach to maximizing fish access to the site.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

Approach. They will establish a large wetland complex to create giant garter snake habitat, including linear channels and open water. There will be limited planting. They will enhance upland and wet meadow grassland areas for wintering sandhill cranes. They will establish a flood flow relief system that has stormwater detention capacity until flood stage and then flow will spill

into the habitat area (release valves), reducing flooding threat to nearby residents. They will create additional flood capacity and provide public access. The flood plain area will have a flap gate drainage system to allow outflow and prevent entrapment of aquatic species.

Assuming the restoration plan is sound, the approach for the project seems fine and objectives should be met. The long-term monitoring will add to our base of knowledge regarding restoration and should be useful to planners of future restoration designs. Unfortunately they didnt provide enough information about the monitoring for us to assess whether it will be done at a level that will be most useful.

Reviewer: If monitoring is done appropriately there is a potential to learn quite a bit about restoration of subsided riparian/riverine wetlands and the information will be quite valuable in designing future restoration projects.

We do not know how the development of a monitoring plan will be carried out.

Feasibility. Except for Figure 6, there is no detailed explanation of the restoration plan. The water release structures are shown in Figures 8 & 9 but no text explanation is given. Are we to assume that this has already been approved by CalFed and has met all design criteria. If this is the case and everything works as planned the project may be feasible and the likelihood of success is high.

Reviewer: Habitat enhancement features are a specialty of the applicant and are expected to be successful.

Capabilities. The applicants appear to be well qualified to conduct the study. They have a proven track record.

Reviewer: Expertise for on-site engineering and installation of water control structures is not documented.

Performance Measures. They say that monitoring will include the restored levee stability, re-colonization by the giant garter snake, entrapment of aquatic species, use of habitat by target species, hydrology, and vegetation cover. But they give no details at all about how they will monitor for all these variables. How many samples? where are the sampling sites? how frequent is the sampling? what are the sampling methods?, etc. This is a concern of both external scientific reviewers as well.

Reviewer: Performance measures are not identified and there is no baseline monitoring.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

   Assuming the restoration design is sound and the hydrology is correct, products include enhanced habitats for fish and wildlife, improved flood management, and increased recreational opportunities. The value of the monitoring component cant be assessed because no details as to how it will be conducted are provided. The experience gained about how to engineer a successful restoration will be valuable.

Reviewer: The experience gained about how to engineer a successful restoration will be valuable.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   The budget is reasonable, but there is confusion about the funds requested. The project costs 842K and they say they have 600K, but on p. 3 it looks like they have 700K from other partners ($600K from Wildlife Conservation Board, $50K each from Bureau of Reclamation and Packard Foundation).

   Reviewer: The amount requested seems modest for the scale of the project.

   With the extensive cost sharing, the project costs are very low.

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

   Rank High

   All else ok property in refuge boundary, meets regional priorities of habitat corridor, flood protection, and multi-species, linked to other projects in region, coordinated with state, federal, and local agencies.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

   Prior performance reviewer says N/A because hasnt dealt with this applicant before

   Environmental compliance need CEQA (applicant says will be completed by spring 2002) and NEPA compliance (applicant says dont need NEPA), a State Lands Commission land use lease, and Reclamation Board approval, also need approval from CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulation and County Agriculture Commission if they will use pesticide for non-native plant eradication. Reviewer says that applicants need to identify what permits have been funded by CalFed. Construction could be delayed if time for compliance is insufficient.

   Budget difference of $600K. (This is the portion being cost-shared.)

Miscellaneous comments:

This project is worthy of receiving the additional funds to implement the actual restoration of this property. The major negative was the lack of monitoring details and therefore the inability to assess whether the monitoring will be adequate or not.

Lack of monitoring detail is a big concern to reviewers.

Land Acquisition:

Proposal Number: 3

Applicant Organization: American Land Conservancy

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

1. Is the site's ecological importance documented in the proposal?

   XYes **-**No

   If yes, please import relevant text and citations here:

   The 537-acre Sun River property occurs in the North Delta Ecological Management Unit of the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Plans Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Ecological Management Zone. It is located within the heart of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and shares a common border with the Refuges South Stone Lake unit. The Refuge is part of the Stone Lakes/Cosumnes River Basin and is adjacent to the Cosumnes River Preserve.

   Historically, the site was at the transition zone between the Delta wetlands and uplands. Based on soils, it probably supported a mosaic of perennial and seasonal wetlands, as well as riparian and grassland habitat. Local farmers constructed levees and pumped down water levels to allow reclamation of the land for agriculture. Aerial site photographs from 1937 show the vast majority of the site in agricultural crop production.

   Presently, approximately 169 acres of the 537-acre site are part of the mosaic of riparian and tule marsh wetland complex associated with South Stone Lake. The remainder is surrounded by levees constructed by the former landowners. A portion of the site is now grazed to maintain short grass habitats. These levees periodically fail and allow flooding of major portions of the property. These levee failures can offer minor flood relief to the local rural community of Point Pleasant because levee failures during certain levels of flooding can relieve Point Pleasant from some flood pressure. This flood protection value is limited by the sites lack of drainage. After the area floods, the water normally must be pumped out due to the site topography, the present levee configurations, and lack of drain outlets. The standing water on the property allows wind-generated waves to erode the inside of the levees, leaving major portions of the levees in an eroded condition. In addition, private landowners must reconstruct the levees after each failure (approximately 7 of the last 10 years), at their expense, or the flood protection value is lost.

   Until recently, much of the region of Sacramento County was historically dry land farmed or grazed. The grazed land provide winter habitat for sandhill cranes and white-fronted geese, and summer foraging for Swainsons hawk etc. Over the last few years, major portions of the historically grazed pasture in the region have been converted to vineyards and urban development. This has caused a significant loss in habitat for these species. Sandhill cranes, geese, and Swainsons hawks have historically used the higher elevation portions of the site, increasing the value of these areas as surrounding land is converted to vineyards.

The project site is also at the downstream end of the Morrison and Laguna Creek watersheds. These watersheds historically supported a subpopulation of giant garter snake one of the subpopulations of giant garter snake that is of concern to the USFWS and California Department of Fish and Game. The site is a priority area for restoration in regards to recovery of this subpopulation and the species, in general (ref letter from USFWS).

The Sun River restoration project will restore backwater floodplain habitat to improve flood management and giant garter snake recovery, and increase habitat function for numerous other species based on the following conceptual model premises: Reestablishing a large habitat area for giant garter snakes should promote their recovery in the Laguna and Morrison Creek watersheds, where they are threatened by loss of habitat. Allowing habitat areas to flood as release valves will have a positive or neutral effect on flood management; Establishing flood plain and backwater slough habitat with a flap gate drainage system will allow outflow and preclude the entrapment of aquatic species; Reestablishing flood plains will have multiple benefits to a number of species; Maintaining upland grassland areas through low duration, high density grazing will provide good forage areas for special status bird species (sandhill cranes, white-fronted geese and burrowing owls); and Providing new public access opportunities to the Refuge will increase usage, recreational opportunities, and advance knowledge of and appreciation for wetland and riparian habitats.

In addition, the Sun River restoration project will open up public access to other Stone Lakes NWR properties which are currently unavailable to the public

Conceptual Restoration Plan The conceptual restoration plan includes a number of wildlife habitat enhancement and flood management features. The goal of the restoration plan is to provide increased habitat for the target species, such as giant garter snakes, sandhill cranes, burrowing owls, Swainsons hawks, wading birds and waterfowl, and other species that use this type of habitat niche, such as western pond turtles, river otters, etc. The restoration plan works with both the existing hydrology of the area and the projected new hydrologic regime associated with the planned flood control improvements under Sacramento Countys proposed 11f alternative. Flood management features are integrated with the habitat development and water management program to enhance habitat values while helping to reduce the water surface elevation during moderate (5 to 40 year flood frequency) events. They include: Overflow weirs in the existing levees set to overflow at approximately the 8.5 to 9.5 elevation to allow the habitat areas to flood before floodwater levels reach the pad elevations of surrounding rural residential community (approximately 9.8 elevation); Water drainage systems that allow flood waters to drain out in a metered fashion, thus reducing downstream peaks and creating flood detention capacity for the next storm event; Reconstruction of existing levees to allow their long term sustainability. Key habitat enhancement features include: Created perennial and seasonal wetlands with narrow open water channels and upland refugia which will provide potential habitat for the giant garter snake; Riparian islands created to help reduce wave energy on the levees, as well as provide nesting habitat for Swainsons hawks and cover and foraging habitat for resident and neotropical migrant birds; Upland pasture managed through grazing to maximize winter habitat for sandhill cranes and white-fronted geese, white-faced ibis, long-billed curlews, and other shorebirds that traditionally use this area, as well as nesting habitat for waterfowl; Earthen mounds created with artificial burrows for burrowing owls and to serve as refugia for the giant garter snake; and Shallow, seasonally flooded wetlands that will offer habitat for waterfowl and wading birds.

Public access to the Refuge will be greatly enhanced by developing facilities, such as a small boat ramp for car top boats, canoes, kayaks and possibly electric motored boats. Hunting blinds will be designed with youth and disabled hunters in mind. Wildlife observation blinds will be located in strategic areas to maximize viewing opportunities and minimize disturbance. The California Department of Fish and Game will administer and monitor the hunting program. The Stone Lakes NWR will control and monitor public access. The California Waterfowl Association will assist in the design of both the hunting programs, and the design of the full access blinds.

The project will also provide educational opportunities by improving public access to a restored, functioning example of the Delta ecosystem within the Refuge. Through restoration, the site will be contoured to specific elevations so that desired wetland and riparian plant communities will recolonize specific habitat zones

The value of aquatic habitats at Sun River will be greatly increased by the restoration of marshslough complexes. Benefits, or outcomes, will occur in three areas: Integrating these habitats with riparian and grassland habitats will support an abundance and variety of fish and wildlife; The habitat development program includes flood management features intended to help reduce the flood damage to the improvements made in the interior of the property and reduce the threat to nearby communities; and The restored habitat will offer increased recreational opportunities in the North Delta for a growing urban population in southern Sacramento County and beyond.

Outcomes: Riparian Functions The value of the project sites riparian habitat corridor will be improved by increasing corridor width and continuity, and interspersing marsh and slough channel habitats to improve habitat complexity. Benefits derived from these restoration actions will include expansion of shaded riverine aquatic habitat for fishes and riparian habitat for resident and neotropical migratory birds and other wildlife. The increased vegetative cover and improved habitat conditions will provide increased nesting, resting, foraging, and escape cover, all of which lead to an increase in abundance of resident and fish and wildlife species.

Outcomes: Special-Status Species The restored habitats will support a number of CALFED Priority I, II, III, and IV species and species groups. In regards to Priority I species, when the Lambert Road flood control structure is overtopped during high water flood events, the South Stone Lakes Basin would provide spawning habitat for Sacramento splittail. If the Lambert Road structure were modified to enhance tidal influence, the property would then provide potential rearing and/or spawning habitat for other Priority I species, such as Delta smelt and Chinook salmon. With the Lambert Road flood control structure in its present design, the projects ability to reduce ecosystem stressors is limited. Priority II species that will benefit from habitat restoration include the Swainsons hawk and Valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Priority III species benefiting from the project include the giant garter snake, western pond turtle, greater sandhill crane, western yellow-billed cuckoo and Sacramento perch. Priority IV species groups benefiting include native resident fishes, waterfowl, shorebirds, wading birds, and neotropical migratory birds. The burrowing owl, short-eared owl, and whitefront and Canada geese would also benefit from the proposed restoration.

The restoration of this property will also contribute to the goals of many regional and federal and state programs and plans, including the Sacramento County General Plan and the South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan. This restoration project will also support the goals and objectives of the Anadromous Fisheries Recovery Plan, the USFWS Central Valley San Francisco Bay Ecoregion Plan, the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture Implementation Plan, USFWS Concept Plan for Waterfowl Wintering Habitat Preservation, North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge goals, and several other

endangered species recovery plans, such as the giant garter snake.

Note also: The substantial body of scientific evidence regarding flooding threats in this section of the Delta (Beach Stone Lakes Flood Control, Sacramento County Report, 1998); The documented need for restoration of large marsh complexes with linear channels to recover giant garter snake populations (USFWS Giant Garter Snake Draft Recovery Plan 1999); The role of grasslands in supporting sandhill cranes and waterfowl species (Littlefield, 2000).

.

2. Is the owner's willingness to sell the site documented in the proposal?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   There is no information about landowner's willingness to sell in the application.

3. Is evidence of local government support for the purchase included in the proposal?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

   The application states only that "the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors ... have been contacted.""

4. Is the use proposed for the site after its purchase clearly consistent with the site's general plan designation and zoning?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   Because the application states (incorrectly, I believe) that no physical change in land use is proposed, no information is provided about local general plan + zoning policies.

5. Is the land mapped as prime farmland, farmland of statewide significance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain the classification:

   No information about farm soils is provided.

   Is the site under a Williamson Act contract?

   -Yes **X**No

Will use of the site change from agriculture after its purchase?

-Yes **X**No -Not Currently in Agriculture

6. Is this a time-sensitive acquisition opportunity, according to the proposal?

-Yes **X**No

If yes, please import relevant text here:

No information about time sensitivity of the project is provided.

Other Comments:

Although the application states that the project involves land acquistion, the budget does not include funds to acquire land. Instead, all funds sought are for restoration activities or project management.

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 3

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

Overall Ranking: **-**Low **-**Medium **X**High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

action oriented project that restores critical habitat corridor in the Delta

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   property already within Refuge Planning boundary

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   habitat corridor, flood protection, multi-species

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Stone Lakes NWR, Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture, HCP

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   coordinated with State, federal, and local agencies

Other Comments:

key area of restoration and protection

monitoring plan will be important for implementation

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **3**

Applicant Organization: **American Land Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**An excellent rating was given, reflecting a comprehensive coverage of the specifications in the solicitation. This proposal is well thought out and should be considered by CALFED.**
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **<u>Goals.</u>** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   Rating: Excellent. This is a continuation of an ongoing project. The goals and objectives are pretty straightforward. Hypotheses are not really hypotheses they are tasks.

2. **<u>Justification.</u>** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

   Rating: Excellent. Good justification presented by applicants.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   Rating: Excellent. Elements of approach documented in detail.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   Rating: Excellent. Feasibility high, especially since this is the final phase.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   Rating: None given.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   Rating: Excellent. The ultimate implementation of the completed restoration is the product. I am curious how they will be able to address both the habitat availability for the fauna and flora, and also accommodate the recreational aspects.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   Rating: Excellent. Team appears to be of high quality.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   Rating: Excellent. Large matching funds for this project. Only 250K requested. The benefit is worth the cost.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **3**

Applicant Organization: **American Land Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

NONE

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;
Good: quality but some deficiencies;
Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**This proposal suffers from a lack of integration of the work that is planned by the partners, specifically in regard to monitoring, which will only include post-construction data collection. Overall, it is probably a very good project that supports the CALFED vision for this area of the Delta, integrating better flood and habitat management.**
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   The goal of the project is to complete restoration of a mosaic of marsh, riparian and grassland habitats within a flood management structure that will also serve hunting and other types of recreational activities. The objectives are clear and follow from the goals. However, there are no hypotheses being tested. Rather, the hyotheses section has a list describing uncertainties from the PSP (RFP). The proposed work, however, will not directly support activities that might address these uncertainties. I am also skeptical that "environmental education" is listed as an uncertainty by CALFED. On the positive side, the plan fulfills several of CALFEDs ERP goals and it could help provide information useful for the program.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

   Building upon previous CALFED funding for the site, it is justified as a full-scale implementation project. The conceptual models are very general (garter snakes will benefit from suitable habitat, greater public access will result in more usage). They are poorly developed and without documentation or figures, but perhaps they are less important for this type of project. However, without such models, reviewers wonder why levees are repaired and maintained with this funding and a flap gate drainage system is needed to "preclude the entrapment of aquatic species" (i.e., fish). It would seem that removal of all riverfront levees would be a simpler approach to maximizing fish access to the site. Certainly past land use and current conditions make restoration a complex problem that may be addressed best by the choices presented. Conceptual models that support those choices would help the reviewer.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   The approach for the portion of the project to be funded in this phase focuses upon on-the-ground restoration. The work is best described in the Conceptual Restoration Plan section on page 4, where "Flood management features are integrated with habitat development." No monitoring is proposed in this phase, or in the budget, but the applicant promises CALFED there will be monitoring following the restoration that will be based on a monitoring plan. We do not know how the development of such a plan will be carried out.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   Creating flood management controls, roads, parking lots and duck blinds are commonplace. Habitat enhancement features are a specialty of the applicant and are expected to be successful. The scale of the project is appropriate.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   The proposal does not identify performance measures, which could be developed from the project outcomes (page 7) in conjunction with the post-restoration monitoring plan for the project. Apparently, there is no baseline monitoring going to be performed at this site.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   The product here is better habitat and flood management within a diked riparian system. The site will also continue to produce waterfowl hunting and construction activities will increase recreational opportunities for people. A synthesis of the activities and habitats produced on the site is needed to produce useful information (final report).

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   The applicant is able to perform the habitat enhancements. On-site engineering and installation of the water control structures requires expertise that is not documented by the applicant in the qualifications section.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   With the extensive cost sharing, the project costs are very low.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #3

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **3**

Applicant Organization: **American Land Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

NONE

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;
Good: quality but some deficiencies;
Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
XExcellent	**The Sun River Project includes consideration of both the environment and human needs. It will preserve and protect existing aquatic habitat, restore, enhance and create additional aquatic habitat, and provide needed upland habitat for species of concern. It will provide improved public access and recreational activities, and in addition address the needs of the disabled to have access to these kinds of areas. Plus the project will integrate a flood management component to protect existing riparian and wetland habitat while creating additional flood capacity.**
-Good	**The proposed funding is for the implementation (next-phase funding)of a previously designed (and presumably permitted) restoration program. The proposed work is both timely and important. Because the design work and permitting for the proposed project has already been funded by CALFED the need for additional funding (the basis of the submitted proposal)to implement the permitted (assumed that this will occur) restoration design is implied, and the requested funding will allow for this to occur. In addition, the proposed project has been endorsed by numerous agencies and the public, and is consistent with local, state and federal policy and guidelines for the region. In addition, the majority of funding (approximately 73 percent) for this project will come from outside sources.**
-Poor	**Based on the information provided in the submitted proposal, and the previous funding for acquisition, and restoration design and permitting, I believe that a full-scale implementation of the proposed project is justified and the proposed project has an excellent chance of being successful.**

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   The overall goals and objectives of the Sun River Property project are in general clearly stated in the proposal. However, the requested funding is for next-phase funding of this ongoing project funded by CALFED. You are not certain of the intended purpose for the requested funding until Item D.1 (Budget), in which it is stated that the requested CALFED funding would contribute to the initial construction cost for the restoration phase of the project. The requests for funds would cover the first three years of a six year project, with the primary costs incurred in the first year. However, the budget spread sheet indicates that the total requested funding (CALFED plus other sources) will be spent in the first year. Where will the funding for the first 2 years of monitoring come from if it is all spent in the first year of the restoration/enhancement phase?

   The Executive Summary for the proposed project should have told the reader the specific reason for the requested funding. The proposal preparers should have paid more attention to detail and making sure that statements made in each section were consistent with information previously provided.

However, there is no question that this is a project that should receive additional funding to allow for the implementation of a sound habitat restoration and enhancement plan that has been endorsed by numerous agencies and the public, and is consistent with local, state and federal policy and guidelines for the region. The proposed funding is for the implementation of a previously designed (and presumably permitted) restoration program. The proposed work is both timely and important. Because the design work and permitting for the proposed project has already been funded by CALFED the need for additional funding to implement the permitted design is implied, and the requested funding will allow for this to occur.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

   The proposed project is justifed in several ways:

   1) The request is for next-phase funding to implement an already completed restoration/enhancement design (and likely permitted) for the Sun River Project.

   2) The proposed work is to implement a restoration/enhancement design that is being reviewed by numerous agencies and, if approved will meet permitting, regulatory and policy guidelines.

   3) Based on statements in this proposal, one of the applicants (Wildlands, Inc.) has direct experience in implementing the work proposed in this proposal.

   4) The proposed work would meet local, regional, state, and federal objectives for preserving, restoring, enhancing and managing land with the diversity of habitats identified in this proposal.

   The requested funding from CALFED would be for construction. However, it is part of a larger request to fund the implementation and first 2 years of monitoring for this program. The proposed monitoring is presented in general terms and it cannot be determined if it will meet the stated objectives.

   A full-scale implementation of the proposed project is justified. Because the design work and permitting for the proposed project has already been funded by CALFED the need for additional funding to implement the permitted design is implied, and the requested funding will allow for this to occur. In addition, the majority of funding (approximately 73 percent) for this project will come from outside sources.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   The approach for the proposed funding is to implement a previously designed and permitted habitat restoration and enhancement for the Sun River Project. This meets the objectives of the project (which is implementation of the approved design).

   Because there will be at least five years of monitoring, and the land will eventually be transferred to and managed by USFWS, the project will add to the "base of knowledge." The information will be valuable to decision-makers if a proposed monitoring program is properly planned and implemented.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   Because the design has been prepared under previous CALFED funding, and state and federal permits required for the work, it is assumed that the approach has been fully documented and is technically feasible. None of the general statements made in this proposal lead me to believe otherwise. There are also similar projects in the region. The planning, design, implementation and monitoring components of these similar projects shold have been used for the proposed project. The likelihood of this project being successful is high because of the long term goal to transfer the property to the USFWS and also to implement a 5-year monitoring program.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   The primary performance measure for the proposed work is to implement a prepared (and likely soon to be permitted) habitat restoration/enhancement design for the Sun River Project. If the approved design is properly implemented then the project can be considered a success relative to the work proposed under this proposal. However, the monitoring plans outlined in the overal Sun River Project, and for which the proposed funding includes the first 2 years of monitoring, are general and vague. There is no guarantee that performance measures for the project will be adequately assessed. My guess is that the monitoring requirements are being determined through the permitting process (both state and federal programs) and will be implemented using the requested funding.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   The experience gained from implementing the approved design and monitoring the success of restoration in aquatic, wetland and upland habitats will be useful to refuge managers. It will provde additional information for projects undertaking similar efforts to restore and enhance historically degraded and disturbed, as well as protect habitat.

   A determination of the value of the proposed monitoring for other restoration projects is difficult. Any statemnts regarding monitoring are general, and it is stated that the restoration project will comply with all regulatory monitoring requirements, as stipulated by state, federal and local authorities. A final monitoring plan has not yet been prepared.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   The proposal applicants have a proven track record of similar project experience and should be qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project. The same likely applies to infrastructure and other project support needs.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Given the size and scope of the proposed work the budget appears reasonable and adequate.

Miscellaneous comments:

The Sun River Project is an example of a project that includes consideration of both the environment and human needs. It will preserve and protect existing aquatic habitat, restore, enhance and create additional aquatic habitat, and provide needed upland habitat for species of concern. It will provide improved public access and recreational activities, and in addition address the needs of the disabled to have access to these kinds of areas. Plus the project will integrate a flood management component to protect existing riparian and wetland habitat while creating additional flood capacity.

Because the proposal is for next-phae funding, and the restoration and enhancement design likely permitted, it is assumed that the funding proposed for in this proposal is a requirement for the Sun River Project.

External Scientific: #4

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **3**

Applicant Organization: **American Land Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

<u>Excellent:</u> outstanding in all respects;
<u>Good:</u> quality but some deficiencies;
<u>Poor:</u> serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**This project is worthy of receiving the additional funds to implement the actual restoration of this property. The only negative I found was the lack of monitoring details and therefore the inability to assess whether their monitoring will be adequate or not.**
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **<u>Goals.</u>** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   With an earlier CalFed grant they acquired the 537 acre Sun River property and developed a restoration plan for it and obtained permits. It will eventually be turned over to the USFWS for management when restoration and initial monitoring are complete. Currently there are 169 acres of marsh, riparian, and aquatic habitat and 368 acres of upland, mostly agriculture surrounded by levees. They propose to convert 180 acres of upland to marsh/aquatic habitat and enhance 174 acres of associated upland. To do this they will re-contour and build levees, which will restore backwater floodplain habitat to improve flood management. They will also increase public use of the area and education, hunting, and boating opportunities.

Their goals and objectives are clear. Since the design and permitting has been done, it is timely and logical to fund this stage of the project now.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

   The current levees fail periodically and a major portion of the property floods. The problem is that, although it offers flood relief, the water doesn't drain out and has to be pumped. Waves are generated by the wind and cause erosion of the levees which then need reconstructing. They would put in overflow weirs in existing levees set to overflow before floodwater levels reach elevations of the residential community. They would put in water drainage systems allowing drainage in a metered fashion to reduce downstream peaks. They would reconstruct some levees so they are sustainable over a long time. They will create some riparian islands to reduce wave energy and provide nesting habitat for Swainson's hawks etc. They will manage the upland pasture grazing to maximize use by cranes, geese, ibis, etc. They will create some earthen mounds for burrowing owls and the garter snake. They'll put in a boat ramp and hunting and observations blinds.

   The project will restore wetland and riparian habitats that will be used by target species (giant garter snake, sandhill cranes, etc.), provide flood control, and increase public access, so there is adequate justification to fund this now. The design portion of the project has been funded and is currently in place and ready to go - the full scale implementation is justified. The underlying basis for the proposed work is explained.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   They will establish a large wetland complex to create giant garter snake habitat, including linear channels and open water. There will be limited planting. They will enhance upland and wet meadow grassland areas for wintering sandhill cranes. They will establish a flood flow relief system that has stormwater detention capacity until flood stage and then flow will spill into the habitat area ("release valves"), reducing flooding threat to nearby residents. They will create additional flood capacity and provide public access. The flood plain area will have a flap gate drainage system to allow outflow and prevent entrapment of aquatic species.

   Assuming the restoration plan is sound, the approach for the project seems fine and objectives should be met. The long-term monitoring will add to our base of knowledge regarding restoration and should be useful to planners of future restoration designs. Unfortunately they didn't provide enough information about the monitoring for us to assess whether it will be done at a level that will be most useful.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   Except for Figure 6, I don't see any detailed explanation of the restoration plan. The water release structures are shown in Figures 8 & 9 but no text explanation is given. I guess we assume that this has already been approved by CalFed and has met all design criteria. If this is the case and everything works as planned I think the project is feasible and the likelihood of success is high.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   They say that monitoring will include the restored levee stability, re-colonization by the giant garter snake, entrapment of aquatic species, use of habitat by target species, hydrology, and vegetation cover. But they give no details at all about how they will monitor for all these variables. How many samples? where are the sampling sites? how frequent is the sampling? what are the sampling methods?, etc.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   Assuming the restoration design is sound and the hydrology is correct, products include enhanced habitats for fish and wildlife, improved flood management, and increased recreational opportunities. The value of the monitoring component can't be assessed because no details as to how it will be conducted are provided.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   The applicants appear to be well qualified to conduct the study.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   The budget is reasonable. I'm confused about the funds requested. The project costs 842K and they say they have 600K, but on p. 3 it looks like they have 700K from other partners ($600K from Wildlife Conservation Board, $50K each from Bureau of Reclamation and Packard Foundation).

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #5

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **3**

Applicant Organization: **American Land Conservancy**

Proposal Title: **Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

Absolutely none!

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;
Good: quality but some deficiencies;
Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**I'd probably give this something between an EXCELLENT and GOOD. Personally I'd like to see a bit more detail on monitoring protocols. Monitoring, if designed well, has the potential to simultainelusly do good basic science AND provide critical information for adaptive management and future design. Poorly designed protocls,(lets assume things are DONE well, no matter what the protocol) have the potential to be a waste of time and $$. A good deal of up front money has already been spent on this. The proposal asks for the last bit and I'd recommend funding (but I probably would ask some questions about monitoring.**
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   The goals and objectives are well articulated. The basic hypothesis being tested here is that a "hard engineered" approach can restore this block of Sun River wetland while at the same time providing appropriate flood control.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project

justified?

I'm not generally a fan of hard engineering to restore ecological systems, but this appears to be a case where such an approach is both justified, and well thought out. In light of the $$ that has already been spent on this project, the additional expenditures represented by this proposal are well justified.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   See comments above. If this is monitored appropriately there is the potential to really learn quite a bit about resotration of subsided riparian/riverine wetlands. My guess is that the information gained here will be quite valuable in designing future restoration projects, and the success (or lack thereof) will be critical to managers.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   It certainly seems to be technically feasible. Odds of "success" (not fully defined in the project proposal), meaning a more functional riverine wetland system at the site, should be quite good if the water control structures work as planned.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   What will be monitored is clearly spelled out and very appropriate. Monitoring protocols, however, do not appear to be presented, so I can't really answer the last part of the above question.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   In addition to restored wetland, the principal "product" likely to come out of this will be the iterative development of our technical understanding of how to hard-engineer water control systems that maximize both "natural" wetland hydorlogic regimes while providing civil flood protection.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   Certainly seem to be qualified and experienced.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

I'm not an engineer, but having worked with engineering intensive projects a bit in the past, the amount requested seems quite modest for the scale of the project. The other partners help here quite a bit.

Miscellaneous comments:

Having invested quite a bit up front, it seems reasonalbe to now finish the job. There is the high possibility of both restoring a great deal of ecological function to the project area, and learning a good bit more about the engineering of appropriate hydrology.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 3

New Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   98-F012, Stone Lakes NWR Land Acquisition; CALFED ERP. the applicant was not the primary contractor for this project (USFWS was), though it is list in table provided

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

I have not administered contract with this applicant, however they are working under separate FWS agreement regarding the project listed above in which FWS was the applicant

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 3

Applicant Organization: American Land Conservancy

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   Ensure the projects previous-phase (ERP 98-F12, Stone Lakes NWR Land Acquisitions) met all environmental compliance requirements.

   Would need CESA and NEPA compliance; a State Lands Commission land use lease; and Reclamation Board approval.

   If non-native plant eradication methodology includes pesticides use, the proposal would need approval from the CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulation and County Agriculture Commission.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   Yes and No:

   Yes: 603 hours are allocated to Admin and management, Year 1 Budget Summary. Yes: The project description (page 8) states that permitting requirements are already funded by CALFED, and that maintenance and monitoring will occur from Years 1 through 5.

   No: The proposal needs to identify what permits have been funded by CALFED, and how they cover the work described in this proposal.

   No: The Budget Summary table does not allocate time or money for initial restoration monitoring that is described in the Executive Summary, or the general maintenance, monitoring and permitting that is included on page 8 of the project description.

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Final design and construction may be delayed if the time allocated for environmental compliance (up to March, 2002) is insufficient, per comments above.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 3

Applicant Organization: American Land Conservancy

Proposal Title: Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain:

   the detail is illustrated in the budget summary and budget justification

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

   -Yes **X**No

   If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

   difference of $600,000. the total cost is $842,404, and calfed's share is $242,404.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes **-**No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: